



MEETING OF THE  
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY OF MARIN  
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 2006  
7:30 PM

ROOM 330  
MARIN COUNTY CIVIC CENTER  
3501 CIVIC CENTER DRIVE  
THE CITY OF SAN RAFAEL, CALIFORNIA

**MEETING MINUTES  
TAM Board Meeting  
November 16<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

Commissioners Present: Al Boro, Vice Chair, City of San Rafael  
Cynthia Murray, Marin County Board of Supervisors  
Charles McGlashan, Marin County Board of Supervisors  
Paul Albritton, Sausalito City Council  
Alice Fredericks, Tiburon Town Council  
Joan Lundstrom, Larkspur City Council  
Peter Breen, San Anselmo City Council  
Michael Skall, Ross Town Council  
Lew Tremaine, Fairfax Town Council  
Dick Swanson, Mill Valley City Council  
Melissa Gill, Corte Madera Town Council

Commissioners Absent: Steve Kinsey, Chair, Marin County Board of Supervisors  
Susan Adams, Marin County Board of Supervisors  
Hal Brown, Marin County Board of Supervisors  
Carole Dillon-Knutson, Novato City Council  
Thomas Cromwell, Belvedere City Council

Staff Present: Dianne Steinhauser, Executive Director  
David Chan, Programming Manager  
Eric Schatmeier, Planning Manager  
Sonia Bailey, Recording Secretary

*Commissioner Boro called the Transportation Authority of Marin meeting to order at 7:42 PM*

**1. Chair's Report (Discussion)**

Commissioner Boro stated that items discussed in the Executive Committee meeting last week will be discussed as action items during this meeting.

**2. Commissioner's Matters not on the Agenda (Discussion)**

None

**3. Executive Director's Report (Discussion)**

ED Dianne Steinhauser stated that copies of the Executive Director's Report have been distributed to the Board. She further stated that the Federal budget for the 2006/07 fiscal year still has not been adopted and that Congress will not adopt a budget but will continue budget levels through continuing resolutions until after January 1, 2007, when the new Congress will come in. ED Steinhauser stated MTC is planning a trip to Washington, D.C. in early March 2007 to coordinate with Congressional reps and she will be inviting Board members to attend the trip. ED Steinhauser congratulated all on the passing of Propositions 1A and 1B. ED Steinhauser reported that one element of the transportation bond that will be discussed later this evening is the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA). She stated that she has been attending meetings every couple of days regarding programming of \$4.5 billion by the CTC, which should happen no later than March 1, 2007. ED Steinhauser also discussed another element of the transportation bond, which is the Trade Corridor Improvement Fund, set up through legislation, requiring a 50% match. ED Steinhauser expressed the difficulty Bay Area agencies face in raising the 50% matching funds. ED Steinhauser stated that it's a challenge for MTC to compete against the southern California contingency to obtain their "share" of the Trade Corridor funds. However, a significant amount of agricultural exports are going through Oakland, rather than through southern California and MTC is using that information to compete for these TCIF funds. ED Steinhauser mentioned that MTC is looking at two primary corridors; the I-80 central corridor and the I-880/580/238 corridor over the Altamont Pass. In spite of the match challenges, there are \$15 billion worth of candidates that have been brought to the attention of the CTC for a \$3 billion program. MTC has offered \$950 million to candidates from the Bay Area. In the bond activity currently underway, there are a few accounts through the transportation bond that have had no activity; i.e., the Transit Account and State Local Partnerships Account. Transit account funding is being prioritized by MTC for transit connectivity and ED Steinhauser is working with MCTD and other small transit operators to bring some of the money to small operators. ED Steinhauser stated that STIP funds received an increase of \$2 billion from the passage of Proposition 1B and the CTC has elected to augment the 2006 STIP with a recommended adoption in June 2007. The funding coming to Marin is approximately \$6.9 million. ED Steinhauser stated that discussions regarding the STIP programming will happen beginning in January 2007.

ED Steinhauser summarized the completion of the four preliminary workshops for the Bike/Pedestrian plan and stated that TAM is working with the consultant Alta Planning and Design to formulate draft plans based on workshop feedback. To be discussed at the December 14<sup>th</sup> TAM meeting is the I-580/Richmond/ City of San Rafael Bridge Bike Pedestrian Access Study. ED Steinhauser reported that MTC will make a presentation on the next steps and what the recommendations might be with respect to MTC finalizing the report. Commissioner McGlashan asked the Board for clarification on the date of next month's meeting. At the direction of the Board, staff will canvass members to determine if December 14<sup>th</sup> or December 21<sup>st</sup> is the best date for the meeting

#### **4. Commissioner Reports**

##### **a) Executive Committee**

Commissioner Boro stated that the several items that were discussed at that meeting are on this agenda.

##### **b) Marin-Sonoma Narrows Policy Advisory Group – None.**

**c) SMART**

Commissioner Boro discussed next steps for SMART, whose sales tax measure failed to pass public approval on November 7th. He reported on a plan that has been developed in which five Commissioners from the SMART Board: Commissioners Jenn, Kerns and Riley from Sonoma County; Commissioner Charles McGlashan and he will serve on a subcommittee. In the next 30-90 days these Commissioners from the SMART Board will analyze the issues that came up during the campaign and figure out how to address problems that were not properly addressed. After the 30-90 day assessment they will return to the Board with their recommendations.

**5. CONSENT CALENDAR (Action)**

**a) Nolte PMO Rate Increase for FY 2007**

**Commissioner Lundstrom moved and the motion was seconded to adopt the Nolte PMO rate increase for FY2007. Commissioner Boro called for a vote and the motion passed unanimously by TAM.**

**6. Caltrans Report (Discussion) – Doanh Nguyen, Caltrans**

Mr. Nguyen reported that Caltrans will begin storm drainage work on November 20, 2006 with an estimated completion date of March 2007. The work will require some fulltime closures with detours. Larkspur sidewalk barrier work is progressing but the wet weather has caused a set back, delaying completion until December 2006. Central San Rafael construction is now 50% complete with the estimated completion on track for the end 2008, if not sooner. West Francisco Blvd opened and work continues to install columns on the 580/101 connector, as well as some drainage work on the northbound side. The Tiburon southbound off-ramp project is scheduled for advertisement at the end of November 2006 and expected to open for bidding in January, with work starting in March 2007.

**7. MCTD Quarterly Report (Discussion) – Amy Van Doren, Transit Planning Manager**

*Attachments: Announcement of Upcoming Changes*

Ms. Amy Van Doren from the Marin County Transit District (MCTD) announced implementation of a new service plan on September 11, 2006. MCTD is currently evaluating the new service plan and is creating a set of improvements to take effect December 10, 2006. The results are cost neutral improvements that reflect three factors; elimination of duplicate/underperforming trips, removal of trips Golden Gate Transit added without MCTD direction, and unscheduled trips. They have responded to the bulk of the public comments received and have provided a summarized copy to the board for review. Primary changes are the improved scheduling of routes 21 and 23 and restored evening services to Fairfax and Mill Valley. In addition, on September 11, 2006, MCTD implemented three community shuttles. On October 30<sup>th</sup>, MCTD improved the afternoon scheduling of one shuttle to provide service to San Rafael High School. In December 2006, MCTD will expand the Marinwood Terra Linda schedule to Lucas Valley and up Manuel T. Freitas Parkway. The City of San Rafael has

approved the changes to the Marinwood/Terra Linda schedule. MCTD informed riders of a temporary route change to the Stage Coach due to Highway 1 closures. Commissioner Tremaine asked Manager Van Doren about the timing of Route 23 and when this will be fixed. She confirmed the scheduling has been fixed for the December 10<sup>th</sup> scheduled improvements mentioned earlier. Rocky Birdsey of the Center for Independent Living, would like clarification regarding the current changes scheduled for December 10<sup>th</sup>, and whether this means further changes would not be accepted for another 4-5 months. Also, could the Public Transit Account (PTA) funds be used for bus stop improvements, and if so, how much? Finally, is MCTD concerned about the Governor's proposal of last January to take the Spillover funding to pay off the bond issue? Mr. Birdsey expressed his concern that the money will not stay with transit but will be used to pay-off the debt. Manager Van Doren stated that Golden Gate Transit does require MCTD to give advance notice in order for them to have their drivers sign up. MCTD would need to submit changes in early January for implementation in March. ED Steinhauser answered the remaining questions posed by Mr. Birdsey. The STIP funds estimated by the MTC as a draft does have funds designated for Marin County in two accounts; \$2.7 million in the State Highway Account and \$4.2 million in the Public Transportation Account. As in the past, the Bay Area aggregates these funds and looks at the highest priority projects in all of the nine Bay Area counties before it assigns funds. The funds can be assigned to transit or highway/road projects. The ED can not guarantee these PTA funds will go towards transit. TAM staff will be working to decide what the priorities really are and see how the funds available match with the priorities of the other eight counties, to aggregate this into a collective list for submission to the CTC for approval in the STIP. In regards to the spillover, there will be a lot of discussion regarding spillover and its dedication to transit and roads. There has historically been a perceived shortfall with the Prop 42 allocation of 40% to STIP, 40% to streets and roads, and only 20% to transit. That very fact is propelling consideration by the legislature on behalf of transit advocates, to direct more of the spillover into transit. There will be ongoing discussions, and the ED strongly encourages MCTD to consider a position on this matter. The ED will monitor the Governor's designation of spillover funds and will update the Board. Commissioner McGlashan asked the ED what happens at the end of five years if the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District is a stand alone entity and will not provide service to Marin County; how would that work and how would that impact them? Commissioner McGlashan assumes that MCTD will undertake a similar exercise. Manager Van Doren stated MCTD does not have plans to look at that exercise right now. Manager Van Doren believes there is some research currently underway, but she is not involved in the project.

## **8. Adoption of Amendment to Strategic Plan (Action)**

ED Steinhauser introduced Dave Chan, TAM Programming Manager. Manager Chan briefly described the amendment, which he stated should be familiar to the Board from September's comment period. When the comment period ended, the ED requested the Board to adopt the amendment. The amendment was reviewed by the Board last month as an information item and has received recommendation for approval by the Executive Committee. The Strategic Plan requires a public review process and so the amendment now returns to the Board as an action item. The Strategic Plan adopted in June programmed approximately \$306,000 into two planning areas. After discussions with TAM and the Public Works Director's Association, TAM staff are recommending that additional funds be advanced one year to fund additional projects in other planning areas. The projects funded are the Miller Avenue Project in Mill Valley and the Novato Blvd Project in Novato. Manager Chan stated that there will be further discussion on these two projects later in the meeting. Dave Chan stated that \$250,000 in 2007/08 fiscal year funds will be moved to 2006/07 for Mill Valley and \$72,000 from 2007/08 fiscal year funds moved to 2006/07 for Novato. Commissioner Boro confirmed there were no further questions or comments.

**A motion was put forward to adopt the amendment to the Strategic Plan, which was seconded. Commissioner Boro called for a vote and the motion passed unanimously by TAM.**

**9. Measure A Allocations – City of Mill Valley Environmental Document and City of Novato Environmental and Design Support Projects (Action)**

Commissioner Boro put forward the motion to adopt the Measure A allocations, which was seconded.

Commissioner McGlashan requested clarification from ED Steinhauser that the Board did review this item in the last meeting. ED confirmed the item was reviewed and stated this was now the allocation of funds per the newly amended Strategic Plan. Dave Chan stated TAM has gone through an extensive public review process with the TAC and that the cities have done a very good job in presenting their case to have the monies made available to them.

**A motion was put forward to adopt the Measure A allocations which was seconded. Commissioner Boro called for a vote and the motion passed unanimously.**

**10. Hwy. 101 Funding Needed for Segment 4 (Action)**

Commissioner Boro requested ED Steinhauser to summarize the staff report. ED stated prior to the October TAM Board meeting she received a near final estimate for the Hwy 101 Project. The project was short \$2 million in funds, to which the Board responded by agreeing to dedicate additional Measure A funds. The final estimate received during the week of October 30<sup>th</sup> 2006, stated the project capital funds for construction, as well as utility relocation costs, environmental mitigation funding, and a minor amount of support funding which has created an additional need for \$4.5 million for the project to be advertised. ED Steinhauser stated that following a review by TAM, in conjunction with Caltrans, they have concurred that \$4.5 million is needed to advertise the project. The Board has yet to dedicate \$1.5 million out of the \$25 million in sales tax in Measure A's Strategy 2 for Highway 101. ED Steinhauser recommended the Board take action to dedicate the last of the Measure A funding for Highway 101 to close the gap, which will still leave a \$3 million gap in order to advertise. ED Steinhauser referenced the staff report to the Board which listed examples on reducing the cost. ED Steinhauser stated that alternatives may reduce project costs by \$1.5 million; however, we have 511 plan sheets that are signed and ready for advertisement. ED Steinhauser recommended not making changes or it might throw the project off schedule. Voting will take place at the CTC meeting on December 14<sup>th</sup> for STIP funds of approximately \$11 million, and TE funds, which were swapped out of the project earlier, totaling \$2.5 million. The project will be advertised in early January. ED Steinhauser stated any changes to the project now will result in a couple of months delay. In terms of reducing costs, she suggested waiting until the bids open and looking at the bid amount, as well as any additional funding that may be found between now and then. She is currently pursuing several possible options for cost reduction that could result in savings over the next few months. Options under consideration are:

1. Relocate dirt from the Hwy 101 Central San Rafael Segment 3 project and use for Segment 4. ED Steinhauser stated the plan is currently under study by Caltrans, and although looked on favorably, it has not been finalized.
2. Eastside Highway 101 - new sound wall panels attached to the existing sound wall. ED Steinhauser stated this will save money by not tearing down the existing wall and constructing new footings and barriers.

ED Steinhauser stated these are some of the cost cutting measures currently in the works, which they hope to be able to implement during the advertising of the project

ED Steinhauser stated they have considered going to the CTC requesting more funds for the project because there is a chance they would respond positively. However, if the project bids are over the engineer's estimate, the additional cost would likely be the responsibility of TAM. ED Steinhauser recommends identifying the funds before the project is advertised and finding ways to reduce the costs. She has identified fund sources the Board has control over, due to the time crunch related to identifying funds to close the gap:

1. Regional Bike/Ped Funds (\$875,000)
2. Clean Air Transportation Funds (\$550,000 this year and an additional \$300,000 next year)
3. Interest Funds that are accumulating to the Measure A funds the County Treasurer is holding for TAM or will accrue this year and next (estimated \$225,000 interest)
4. The City of San Rafael Measure A funds for Local Infrastructure Improvements: understanding is that TAM will use their Local Infrastructure funds on a temporary basis to close the gap and allow bidding (\$1 million). ED Steinhauser stated that after bidding opens the funds will be returned to the City of San Rafael.
5. Non-Motorized Transportation Pilot Program Fund source

Ed Steinhauser stated that the numbers on available funds might vary slightly but the essence of what is available is clear. ED seeks comments from the Board regarding the shortfall.

Commissioner Lundstrom stated she cannot find in the recommendation where it states that funds will be taken from the Non-Motorized Transportation Fund. ED Steinhauser stated that this was correct. The plan is to commit pending funds that are assigned to the City of San Rafael in the local infrastructure pot, which are funds each jurisdiction receives automatically. It is not necessary to use funds from the Non-Motorized Transportation Fund since the City of San Rafael is providing the funds. Commissioner Lundstrom stated that during the Executive Directors Meeting there was discussion on using a combination of the Non-Motorized Transportation Pilot Program and the Bike/Pedestrian, but she did not see it in the final recommendations. Commissioner Lundstrom expressed concern that using all the funds from the Regional Bike/Ped Transportation fund would not allow funding for other areas. ED Steinhauser assured Commissioner Lundstrom that the Bike/Pedestrian funds will be available in future years, and that TDA Article 3 as well as all of the \$20+ Million of Non-Motorized funds will still be available for distribution thru-out the County.

Commissioner Boro solicited additional comments on this matter.

ED Steinhauser submitted a letter to the Board from the Marin County Bicycle Coalition on this matter. In regards to the letter, she mentioned that in June of 2006, a policy issue was brought forth regarding the use of interest funds from the sales tax measure as a matching source for local routine maintenance. The Board did not take action at that time, but directed TAM to take an inventory on the need-level of the north/south trunk system. ED Steinhauser reported that this inventory is in progress with a progress report to be available in January and work completed shortly thereafter. ED Steinhauser recommended returning the interest funds back to TAM, so they can be available for the Board's further policy discussions. Commissioner Boro pointed out that the letter included the recommended wording. ED Steinhauser stated she could not support the letter's recommended wording. ED Steinhauser stated that her recommended wording is, "Upon the opening of bids, in the scrutiny of feasible savings to the project, the TAM priority be that the City of San Rafael receive in return their local infrastructure funds as a first priority for savings or other fund sources and that the interest funds be returned to the TAM accounts as a second priority in the event we find savings or

other funds to fund this shortfall.” ED Steinhauser further stated TAM must find additional fund sources or savings or this will not work.

Commissioner McGlashan asked ED Steinhauser if there was access to Proposition 1B money that could be tapped into. ED Steinhauser stated she does not recommend this project as a candidate for Proposition 1B monies because there are larger projects which are viewed more favorably for those monies. She also stated that the bike-pedestrian facility was not eligible as a stand alone. ED Steinhauser stated that the CTC will not make decisions on Proposition 1B funds until March, which will take the project off schedule. She stated that TAM did approach the Department regarding the use of SHOPP Funds to fill the short fall, but the Department declined the idea.

Commissioner Boro opened the floor for public comment.

Ms. Deb Hubsmith from the Marin County Bicycle Coalition (MCBC) stated her organization’s support of the revised staff recommendation to pay back the interest to the TAM account immediately after the City of San Rafael funds are paid back. She stated it is a critically important project to help fund the Bike-Pedestrian pathway maintenance. She stated she is in support of the Regional Bicycle and Non-Motorized Vehicle funds going towards the project. There are no other sources of funds for routine maintenance except for city general funds. She strongly urged the Board to support the revision to the staff recommendation of paying back the interest funds after the City of San Rafael is paid back.

Don Magdanz, of MCBC, emphasized that the Non-Motorization Pilot Project is a project oriented towards mode shift. The use of funds for maintenance is important, because it is the key to long term use. Commentor further questioned the possibility of using NTPP funds and urged the Board to keep the maintenance funds for the Lincoln Hill Path Way.

Rocky Birdsey of the Center for Independent Living recommended maintaining the funds for maintenance for the pathways. He asked the board if the MCTD surplus could be used towards the funding of the project.

Commissioner Boro confirmed no further questions or comments.

Commissioner McGlashan thanked ED Steinhauser and her team for all of their hard work on the project.

**A motion was put forward for the Highway 101 funding for Segment 4 whereby the priority of repayment would be the City of San Rafael first followed by repayment to the Measure A interest account. The motion was seconded. Commissioner Boro called for a vote and the motion passed unanimously.**

## **11. Adopt Priorities for the I-Bond (Action)**

ED Steinhauser introduced a presentation on two projects under consideration for the \$4.5 billion in CMIA infrastructure bond funds for state highway improvements. ED Steinhauser stated there is strong competition among all nine counties regarding obtaining the funds. The CTC adopted guidance at their November 8<sup>th</sup> meeting. MTC is requesting applications from all CMA’s be submitted by December 1st and the projects’ traffic information to be submitted by next Monday. ED Steinhauser confirmed that TAM can make these schedules. She then introduced Bill Whitney, Project Manager for the Greenbrae Corridor and Sean Charles, Former Caltrans Design Manager on the Marin Sonoma-Narrows who has

brought the policy advisory group through a number of steps looking at the Narrows project. ED Steinhauser then reviewed the two projects and discussed the benefits. The \$4.5 billion CMIA funds are split 40% to Northern California and 60% to Southern California. ED Steinhauser stated that the Bay Area has 85% of the congestion in Northern California and the best candidates will need to be brought forward in terms of their ability to relieve congestion.

ED Steinhauser stated they looked at several projects and their respective merits for providing congestion relief. Due to the limited benefit, she is not recommending adding one of the 580/101 interchange improvement projects to the CMIA account, the northbound 101 to eastbound 580 connector improvements. Instead, she recommended the westbound 580 connector to northbound 101 improvement project. It relieves more congestion and it has already been environmentally cleared. ED Steinhauser recommends widening the 580 to 101 connector when the HOV lanes are opened. She reported that TAM is seeking 100% of the funds from proposition 1B funds in the CMIA funds

ED Steinhauser stated that the purpose and need of the Marin-Sonoma Narrows project is to reduce congestion and increase the economic exchange between Marin and Sonoma Counties. She stated her recommendation is for funding two phases of the project, which is divided into segments A, B, and C. Segment A will widen Highway 101 through Novato by adding an HOV lane, Segment B will convert the existing expressway with 84 access openings to freeway standard and add 8 miles of bike/pedestrian paths as well as a continuous HOV Lane, and Segment C will widen Hwy 101 through Petaluma to add an HOV lane. ED Steinhauser stated the draft environmental document is due for release now in March 2007. Current cost of the project is \$390 million for all three segments; \$51 million for purchasing right-of-way access, and \$119 million for environmental design and construction support, for a total of over \$500 million. ED Steinhauser reported that all of the funding for the design and construction support has been identified, and most of the funding for the right-of-way access has been identified, but there are still shortages in the funding of construction. She stated that the funding breaks down roughly as follows: \$300 million for Segment B, \$100 million for widening through Petaluma, and \$100 million for widening through Novato. ED Steinhauser stated that the tiger salamander environmental assessment is underway, and is driving the schedule for the environmental document, with completion scheduled for 2008. ED stated that the HOV will result in a significant tonnage reduction in carbon emissions. ED Steinhauser recommended the Board accept the 580/101 project as the number one priority for infrastructure bond funding and strongly recommended the Board adopt Narrows Segments B, then A respectively as additional priorities. ED Steinhauser stated her belief that TAM is well positioned to receive the \$300 million for the widening project. She stated that she will report back to the Board on funding the remaining construction on the corridor as information becomes available.

Commissioner Boro opened the topic for questions and comments.

Commissioner McGlashan asked if Sonoma County has included any part of the Marin-Sonoma Narrows Project in their grant requests. ED Steinhauser stated that Sonoma County has projects as tiers 1 and 2. While they do support the Marin-Sonoma Narrows Project, they have projects with higher priorities in central and northern Sonoma. Commissioner McGlashan asked ED Steinhauser what the likelihood was of finding funding for the project. She explained that given certain factors (inter-regional funds, future STIP funds, and down scoping), TAM should be able to develop a funding plan to finish the three segments. Commissioner McGlashan asked ED Steinhauser if she had an idea of the competitiveness for funds based on other long existing projects. She responded that smaller projects could be brought forward; however, most will not fair well in competition against larger projects brought forth from around the Bay Area. Commissioner McGlashan expressed his concerns regarding selling the excess capacity. ED stated that if we capture the funds needed from the infrastructure bond we will



have most of the necessary funds for the project, and as a result, looking for creative fund avenues would be reduced. She specifically stated that this approval does not have anything to do with congestion pricing, but that the topic would be brought back to TAM at a future date.

Commissioner Murray asked ED Steinhauser how the project would be funded if funds were not obtained from the bond measure. Commissioner Murray stated her concerns about congestion, the major safety issue, and more work that will soon come from out of the county. Commissioner Breen stated his concern that the two counties have not thought regionally and that he hoped the result would not put either county at risk. Commissioner Breen asked ED Steinhauser if Sonoma County would be willing to come to the table to discuss the project. ED Steinhauser stated her belief that Sonoma County is looking to MTC and Caltrans for direction. ED Steinhauser stated there are other funds in play, for example ITIP and RTIP funds, and that historically, Marin and Sonoma counties have always come with a unified approach; but Sonoma is addressing other needs specific to their area. ED Steinhauser stated that her big push is to have Caltrans and MTC support for the project to move it forward toward funding. Commissioner Swanson also expressed his support for funding for the project.

Commissioner Boro opened the floor for public comments or questions.

David Schonbrunn of Transdef stated that he is against the staff proposal. He stated that the Marin-Sonoma Narrows Project has a down side for Marin residents because it greatly increases the traffic coming into Marin - up to 2,000 cars per hour. Mr. Schonbrunn stated that Marin County will finally receive some degree of congestion relief after the City of San Rafael Gap Closure. Mr. Schonbrunn is not against a safety project, but feels this is a widening project. He also stated his opposition to the 580 connector project, and questioned the study which stated there is no harm to Northbound 101. Commenter Schonbrunn stated his belief that the proposed projects do not provide a benefit to the constituents the Board represents. Schonbrunn further stated that he believes long interchange improvement projects will fair better in competing for funding because safety is also a consideration. He stated that the SMART project would provide better long term congestion relief than the Marin-Sonoma Narrows Project and that the SMART project could fight global warming. He also stated his belief that widening highways always generates increased traffic and because driving creates 50% of greenhouse gas emissions, this would in turn increase the greenhouse gases in the environment. Mr. Schonbrunn stated that he felt SMART could be built more quickly than a freeway and that if full construction costs were funded through this bond and through the monies already identified, that would allow the use of all future tax measures to be directed to SMART operations. In his opinion, this will allow all day service, better connection service, theater service between the counties, and 7 day-a-week service. He strongly stated his belief that the SMART system could very well reduce congestion. Commissioner McGlashan requested that ED Steinhauser respond to Mr. Schonbrunn comments and ED Steinhauser responded that MTC and the legislators who drafted the legislation creating Prop 1B have made it clear that capital improvement projects for bus transit and rail are not eligible for the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA). Commissioner McGlashan stated his concerns that after we've spent money and time on this project, in 5 years the corridors will fill up again. Commissioner McGlashan also expressed concerns that Sonoma is not standing in support of the project. Commissioner Murray her strong support for the project. Commissioner Breen concurred with both speakers and expressed his hope that we have the foresight of the future to make that 3<sup>rd</sup> lane an HOV lane or an express bus lane. ED Steinhauser confirmed the lane is a carpool lane.

Commissioner Boro stated the Marin-Sonoma Narrows Project should be a top priority for Sonoma County, with a population of over 500,000 people but only two lanes of highway coming in and out of the county. Commissioner Boro expressed his concerns regarding the possibility of Sonoma County

not coming to the table on this project. Commissioner Boro confirmed no further questions or comments.

**Commissioner Murray put forward the motion to adopt the priorities for the I-Bond, which was seconded. Commissioner Boro called for a vote and the motion passed unanimously.**

**12. Hwy 101 Update (Discussion)**

Connie Preston introduced herself and reported that updates were covered in the Caltrans report earlier in the meeting. She addressed the Board and asked if they had additional questions. Commissioner Boro confirmed no further questions or comments.

**13. Open Time for Items Not on the Agenda**

Commissioner Boro opened the floor for additional items not on the agenda.

Mr. Schonbrunn referred to an article in today's Marin Independent Journal newspaper that stated it would be cheaper to bring BART to the North Bay than SMART. Mr. Schonbrunn stated that BART construction costs 20 times more per mile more than SMART.

A resident of the Marinwood Village Project/Marinwood Association stated that his organization is working with Commissioner Adams on plans to relieve freeway jumpers in his area, which if successful will put them back on the Hwy101 freeway. He stated the issue will be brought back to the Board at a future date.

*By Order of Commissioner Boro, the TAM meeting adjourned at 9:33 pm.*